DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 253 95 EA 011 168

AUTHOR Feldhusen, John F.
TITLE Behavior Problems in Secondary Schools. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO DHEW-NIE-P-770202
PUB DATE Oct 78
NOTE 29p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Anti Social Behavior; *Behavior Problems; Delinquent Identification; *Discipline Problems; Educational Environment; Failure Factors; *Literature Reviews; Parent Child Relationship; *Research Reviews (Publications); School Responsibility; School Vandalism; Secondary Education; Student Teacher Relationship; Teacher Role; Television Viewing; Truancy; Violence

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the problems of antisocial student behavior in schools, tries to identify causes, and examines programs and procedures for remediating and preventing such behavior. This review focuses particularly on senior and junior high schools and all forms of antisocial, aggressive, disruptive behaviors that interfere with school functioning. The report concludes that the problems of school discipline, violence, crime, vandalism, and truancy have grown to large proportions in many American schools. Principals and school boards often seem reluctant to admit the problems that begin or are caused by forces outside the school. Poor home conditions, television violence, a climate of crime in the community, gangs, and peer crime influences are all initial contributors to the problems that surface in schools. But, the author contends, the school also contributes with poor teaching, a negative school climate, a dose of failure for many students, and irrelevant curricula. The school can take positive action along with other youth agencies to alleviate the problem and even create a positive social and academic climate in which all youth can succeed. A set of recommendations for action by educators is presented. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165253

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Behavior Problems In Secondary Schools

John F. Feldhusen

Purdue University

Final Report

NIE P 770202

The review presented herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

October, 1978

EA 011 168

Behavior Problems In Seconuary Schools

John F. Feldhusen
Purdue University

In each decade one or more problems of the schools reach the crisis stage. In the 50s and early 60s teachers and teacher education were major foci of critics of public education. In the 60s the student protest movement, disadvantaged students, and curriculum reform were major concerns. In the 70s educators are worried about declining achievement, mainstreaming, and crime and violence in the schools. The problems of school violence capture attention daily in magazine reports of the problems and newspaper accounts of violence and crime in the schools. Once thought to be a problem of inner and big city schools, the problem now seems to be spreading to schools in suburbia, rural areas, and even small towns.

The purpose of this paper is to review and clarify the problems of antisocial student behavior in school, to try to identify causes, and to examine programs and procedures for remediating or preventing such behavior. This review focuses particularly upon the high school and junior high and upon all the behavior problems which arise out of interaction between teachers and students and administration and students, and among students themselves. The term "violence" is used in referring to antisocial school behavior because assault, aggression and criminal acts now characterize much of the school discipline problem. This review will be concerned with all forms of antisocial, aggressive, disruptive behaviors which violate school expectations and which interfere with the orderly conduct of teaching. Thus, the range is from mild student discipline problems such as talking out of turn all the way to violent attacks upon fellow students or teachers.

The review will first deal with the problem itself, its nature, severity and growth. In the second part causes and underlying conditions of the problem will be examined. In the third and final part approaches to solution, treatment and programs will be analyzed and evaluated.

The Problem

The two most thorough sources of documentation of the problem are the Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by Senator Birch Bayh (1977) and the National Institute of Education's Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Violent Schools--Safe Schools

(1977). Senator Bayh's Subcommittee surveyed 757 school systems; met with representatives of 70 educational, governmental and private organizations; and interviewed 30 expert witnesses. The Subcommittee report states that ". . . there is abundant evidence that a significant and growing number of schools in urban, suburban and rural areas are confronting serious levels of violence and vandalism" (p. 8). During the period 1970-1973 assaults on students rose 85%, assaults on teachers, 77%. Weapon seizure in schools also rose 54%, rape was up 40%, and robbery, 36%. Throughout the United States 70,000 teachers are physically attacked each year and 100,000 have their property vandalized. Vandalism to school property is also staggering in cost--approximately $216 million per year according to the NIE report.

The NIE Report, Violent Schools--Safe Schools (1977) notes that acts of violence and property destruction in schools increased steadily through the 60s and early 70s but now seems to be leveling off or even declining in some areas. It also suggests that Senator Bayh's Subcommittee report may have overestimated the percentage increases in this period. The Report notes that the risk of violence to adolescents, especially at the junior high level, is far greater in school than out of school. A total of 68% of robberies and 50% of assaults on youth at this age level occur in school while only 17% and 19% occur out of school. In any given month 2.4 million high school students have something stolen, 282,000 are attacked, and 112,000 are forcefully robbed on school premises. The risks for junior high school students are about twice as great as for high school students.

The NIE Report notes that principals' estimates of offenses in high schools are conservative. This is probably due to a reluctance to concede that there is a problem. The Bayh report even noted the case of a teacher who, after testifying to the Subcommittee, was threatened with termination by her school -- because of her honest revelation of problems. Furthermore, crime in schools generally goes unreported to the police. The NIE report says only one-sixth of physical attacks were reported. Thus, it is likely that the high school may even be a safe haven for the commission of crimes.

A large portion of attacks on high school students are interracial--42%--and 46% of robberies are interracial, although this figure is not greater than what one would expect given the composition of schools. The victim is likely to be in the minority group at the school. Neighborhood and school size also relate to the high school crime problem. The rate of violence in school is proportional to the presence of gangs and criminal activity in the area of the school. Furthermore, large high schools and schools which have large classes seem to suffer from much more violence, crime and vandalism.

Dr. Owen B. Kiernan, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals testified to the Bayh Subcommittee in 1975. He reported that a poll of the nation's

secondary principals revealed five major problems related to student behavior: (1) vandalism and violence, (2) defiance of rules, (3) neglect of studies and wasting time, (4) smoking in school, and (5) absenteeism or truancy. He also reported that there was a great increase in student-teacher conflicts. Dr. Kiernan noted that the problem of supervision of high school students now extends to the hallways, toilets, cafeterias and libraries whereas it was once quite limited to the classroom. Acts of violence and crime occur in all these locations. The NIE Safe Schools Report reported that hallways and stairs were the most dangerous places for violence whereas classrooms were the safest.

The National School Boards Association conducted a survey of over 100 school districts throughout the United States and published their results in Report: Discipline in Our Big City Schools (1977). Their results show clearly the concentration of the problem at the junior high level. For example, for the problem of refusing to obey, the incidence at the junior high level was 2.2 times as frequent as at the senior high level. For fighting the frequency was 3.2 times as great at the junior high level as senior high. Clearly the problems of antisocial and delinquent behavior are concentrated at the junior high level.

In a book titled The Unruly School Robert J. Rubel (1977) reports his extensive review of the problems of disorders, disruptions and crime in the schools. His major thesis is that the character of antisocial behavior in schools has undergone drastic changes. Six major trends are reported: (1) the misbehavior of high school students has changed from simple classroom disorders such as insubordination to acts of violence against persons and property; (2) the rate of increase of anti-social behavior is far greater than the rate of growth of high school population; (3) the intensity of certain acts of violence has increased tremendously--use of weapons and murder are now far more common; (4) the school's administrative response is increasingly legal--use of the courts; (5) schools are employing security guards; (6) schools are institutionalizing their methods of dealing with crime, violence, and disorders.

Extensive reviews of the problem of violence and crime in the schools brought the problem home to the general public in the pages of Newsweek, Time, and Psychology Today (DeCecco & Richards, 1975). Newsweek (September 12, 1977) characterized the problem as the big city's nemesis. "In the big cities of America, the public school was once a temple of sorts; it is fast becoming a ruin" (p. 62). Newsweek says that students' achievement levels are 3-5 years below average, truancy is becoming an epidemic, and dropping out is becoming common. Time (November 14, 1977) concluded that American education in the 70s is in deep trouble, and the problem extends far beyond the big cities. In its description of schools in Medford, Massachusetts, Coos Bay, Oregon, and Iowa City, Iowa Time finds that the pervasive problems are declining achievement, rising violence, economic crises, teacher strikes, and high

rates of absenteeism or truancy. In Psychology Today DeCecco & Richards (1975), after interviewing over 8000 students in 60 junior and senior high schools, report that "America's high schools are drifting toward a kind of anarchy. All rules are questioned; students openly defy teachers; students attack one another." In his title for the article DeCecco characterizes the problem, perhaps too dramatically, as "Civil War In The High Schools."

Daniel Duke (1978) conducted a survey of school administrators and asked them to rank a list of school discipline problems in order of seriousness. Skipping class, truancy and lateness to class were ranked as most serious while profanity, fighting and disruption were ranked least serious. However, Duke noted that this view would probably not be shared by teachers who are more likely to view in-class discipline problems as the most serious. Duke also noted that students view theft and fighting as the major problems, probably because these are the problems in which they are victimized. Duke concluded that each of the three major role groups--administrators, teachers and students--perceive a different set of problems as the major difficulty facing the high school.

The major problem facing teachers, according to the National Education Association's Teacher Survey, is discipline in the classroom (1974, 1976). Similarly the Gallup Poll of The Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools shows discipline as the major problem facing the public schools (1977). While 26% of the national sample identified "lack of discipline" as the major problem, the next highest ranking problem, "integration/segregation/busing," was identified by only 13% of the sample. Other related youth problems and the corresponding percentages were "use of drugs," 7%, "pupils' lack of interest," 3%, "crime/vandalism," 2%, and "drinking/alcoholism," 1%. The problems of absenteeism and truancy were also treated. Absentee rates were reported as high as 30% in a big city. Should parents be brought to court and fined for their children's absenteeism? Yes, was the response of 51% of the sample.

From this brief review of behavior problems in secondary classrooms, it seems clear that secondary schools are indeed faced with a tremendous challenge in dealing with the social behavior of students. While the primary task of the school may be to teach basic skills and subject matter, a secondary goal must be to help young people develop responsible and effective social behavior. This second goal is even prerequisite to the first. The problems reviewed represent a continuum of antisocial behaviors ranging from simple acts which annoy the teacher such as talking aloud through criminal behaviors such as assault with a weapon, drug abuse, robbery, and vandalism. The problems of discipline, crime and violence in the schools are exacerbated by high rates of absenteeism and truancy, drug abuse, and alcoholism. It seems clear that all of these problems are closely linked to and overlap with the problems of student dropouts and delinquency. School personnel are faced with a tremendous challenge. At present it often seems that, at best, schools are merely trying to cope with

the problem, or at worst to deny it. However, as will be seen later in the review, there is no large bank of tried and proven ideas to draw upon in attempting a solution to the problems. Of course, the community at large beyond the school is beset by similar problems of antisocial behavior and youth crime. In a sense the school is just a part of a large pattern of social disruption. Since youth are concentrated in junior and senior high schools for large amounts of time, it is natural that there is a concentrated display of the adverse behaviors. However, it is possible, as the review will show later, that the schools may be a spawning ground for some of the problems which manifest themselves in and out of school.

The Causes

In this second part of the review literature dealing with correlates and causes of the problem behaviors reviewed in the first part of this report will be examined. Perhaps it is contradictory to say "correlates and causes" since most of the research on causes of antisocial behavior is correlational or post hoc analysis. Some of this review will also deal with expert opinion. Four general clusters of causes will be examined: (1) psychological and sociological variables; (2) television; (3) school and educational influences, and (4) other variables.

Psychological and Sociological Variables

Jessor and Jessor (1977) interpret results of their four-year longitudinal study of junior high, high school, and college youth as revealing ". . . strong support for the general concept of problem behavior by revealing an interrelatedness--a syndrome character" (p. 236). Problem behaviors included aggression, stealing, lying, drug use, drunkeness and property destruction. The adolescent who is likely to engage in such problem behavior is one who does not value academic achievement, does not expect to do well academically, is much concerned with independence, regards society as problematic and deserving criticism and reshaping, has a tolerant attitude toward transgressions, and lacks interest in conventional institution such as church and school. However, the Jessors note that this set of correlates of problem behavior is synonymous with a set of developmental trends which characterize most youth: growth of independence, decline of traditional ideology, increase in relativistic morality, increase in peer orientation, and increase in modelling of problem behavior. Thus, they conclude that ". . . the normal course of developmental change in adolescence is in the direction of greater problem proneness" (p. 238).

Lefkowitz, Huesmann, Wolder and Eron (1973) reported a longitudinal study of 875 boys and girls first identified in grade 3. Data gathered when the students were in grade 3 were used to predict concurrent grade 3 aggressive behavior and aggressive behavior 10 years later. They found that the best concurrent predictors were parental rejection and SES variables for boys and

girls while IQ and TV violence viewing were good predictors for boys and identification with the mother for girls. SES variables and TV violence viewing were also good long range predictors for boys and girls. They also found that all simple correlations among IQ and current and future measures of aggression were significant. However, they noted that the correlations of school achievement with aggression were quite high (-.39 for boys, -.36 for girls) suggesting that low IQ is really a limiting factor which restricts a child's capacity to learn socially acceptable behavior and predisposes him/her to low achievement which breeds frustration and resulting aggression.

Feldhusen, Thurston and Benning (1973) conducted a longitudinal study of 1550 children who exhibited persistent prosocial or aggressive-disruptive behavior in grades 3, 6 or 9. Cohorts for each grade level were identified by classroom teachers who were also asked to specify the aggressive-disruptive behavior displayed by each student. They were tested extensively, their parents were interviewed, and followup measures of criterion behaviors were secured for eleven years. In the realm of home, family and parent variables they found that aggressive-disruptive youngsters were substantially disadvantaged in terms of the home, family, and parental situation when compared with prosocial youngsters. They found that for aggressive-disruptive youngsters:

(1) The discipline by the father was either lax, overly strict, or erratic.

(2) The supervision by the mother was only fair or downright inadequate.

(3) The parents were indifferent or even hostile toward the child.

(4) The family members were engaged in diverse activities and the family operated only somewhat as a unit or perhaps not at all.

(5) The parents found it difficult to talk things over regarding the child.

(6) The husband-wife relationship lacked closeness and equality of partnership.

(7) The parents found many things to disapprove of in their child.

(8) The mothers were not happy with the community in which they lived.

(9) The parents resorted to angry, physical punishment when the child did wrong. Temper control was a difficult problem for them at this time.

(10) The parents believed that they had little influence on the development of their child.

(11) The parents thought that other children exerted bad influences upon their child.

(12) The parents' leisure time included few cultural or intellectual activities.

(13) The parents, particularly the father, reported no church membership. Even if members, church attendance by them tended to be sporadic.

(14) The parents had less education and if they were employed, were in lower level occupations.

Feldhusen, Thurston and Benning also found a number of school factors related to aggressive-problem behavior. The aggressive-disruptive children had an average 9 points IQ deficit, had significantly lower reading and mathematics achievement test scores, were significantly more inclined to drop out of school, and graduated, (if they stayed in school) at far lower ranks in the senior class. Teacher ratings of the personality and social characteristics were significantly lower, and the aggressive-disruptive youngsters continued to display these characteristics up to eight years after the original identification.

Feldhusen, Roeser and Thurston (1977) did regression analyses of their data to develop equations to predict social adjustment over a 9-year period. Some of the best long range predictors were the original behavior status as identified by teachers, IQ, reading scores, and the father's educational level. Feldhusen, Aversano and Thurston (1976) also did discriminant analyses to develop delinquency prediction equations. They found that such long-range prediction was possible with up to 79% accuracy using the original behavior assessment by teachers, sex, IQ, home location, scores from the KD Proneness Scale, and an aggressive behavior index as predictors. Notable is the fact that the original behavioral assessment by teachers is a significant long range predictor of social adjustment and delinquency.

Justice, Justice and Kraft (1974) used, as sources of information, 1500 literature references, 779 interviews with professionals who work with troubled youth, and 1055 case studies of school children in an effort to identify major early warning signs of violent and aggressive behavior at the elementary school level. They found that there were four major early signs: fighting, temper tantrums, misbehavior in school and truancy, and social maladjustment.

Peer and gang influences seem to be significant factors in the etiology of violent and aggressive behavior in school and delinquency. The Senate Subcommittee on Delinquency (Bayh, 1977) reported that modern gangs are extending their activities into

the schools. The school becomes a recruiting ground, and admission to many gangs requires some act of violence, aggression, robbery or theft. Gang members are increasingly armed and often use the schools as bases for extortion, drug sales, and other profit making crimes.

Neill (1978) also discussed the problem of gang influences and violence in the schools. She asserted that the Latin gangs now pose the greatest threat in many big city schools. She points out that gangs are a phenomenon chiefly of the big cities and that they are the chief cause of fear among teachers and students. They promote violence and are effective because gang members are armed.

Peer influences have also been shown to be causes of delinquent, aggressive and violent behavior in and out of school settings. Conger (1976) interprets peer influences from the point of view of social learning theory which stresses modelling and reinforcement as modes of learning for delinquent behavior. The similarity and faddishness of youth crimes show clearly the effect of observational learning. Knight and West (1975) found that terminating association with misbehaving and delinquent peers was a major factor in youth resistance to delinquent behavior. Gang pressures and peer influences are probably influential causes of much school violence.

Television

A second area of causation of school violence, aggression and general misbehavior may be television viewing. Liebert (1974) reviewed the research on the relationship between TV viewing and aggression. He reported that about 80% of programs contain some violence and that the percentage seems to keep growing in spite of some pressures to the contrary. Children spend many hours a day watching programs which include violence even though hundreds of studies have clearly established the powerful modelling effects of TV. Learning by observation is probably the major form of social learning for children. Liebert also noted that learning from TV is long lasting and that the general lesson of TV is that violence by the good guys or the bad guys succeeds. From studies of the effects of TV on attitudes, Liebert concludes that "There is a reliable and socially significant relationship between the amount of violence which a child sees on entertainment television and the degree to which he is aggressive in his attitudes and behavior" (p. 102). Liebert also reviewed research which shows that the causal link is from TV viewing to aggressive behavior, not vice versa. Liebert concluded that ". . . beyond the reasonable shadow of doubt. . . watching television violence produces antisocial attitudes and behavior. . ." (p. 104).

Leifer, Gordon and Groves (1974) also reviewed the effects of TV on students. They also concluded that viewing televised aggression contributes to aggressive behavior. The greater the similarity between events portrayed on TV and a student's own surroundings, the more likely that the student will imitate

aggression. Leifer et al. also discussed the great positive values that might accrue from television programs which model prosocial behavior and attitudes. However, they note that the TV industry is motivated by one essential motive, economic, and violent programs currently offer the best payoffs. They conclude with a plea for diversified content and more parental direction of children's TV viewing.

Greenberg (1975) compared British and American TV for their impact on children's behavior and attitudes. He noted that violence runs high on British TV because so many programs are imported from the U.S., but the British viewing day is shorter. Greenberg also did a questionnaire study of 726 9, 12 and 15 year old children to evaluate the relationship between their TV viewing and aggressive attitudes. He found that about half the children regularly viewed violent programs. He concluded that there is a relationship between watching programs high in violence and aggressive attitudes but the relationship is moderate.

The Report of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior (1972) concluded cautiously that there seems to be a link between viewing violence on television and aggressive behavior. However, these reviews and studies of the relationship between TV violence and aggressive behavior and attitudes seem to suggest that TV is a major contributor to the surge of violent and aggressive behavior currently besetting schools and communities. In school it may take the form of discipline problems or full blown crime such as assault and robbery. On the streets the problems of delinquency and crime are still much more serious. Clearly when the major entertainment medium to which students are exposed models and glorifies so much violence, it is small wonder that the resulting violent behavior now confronts us as a huge social problem.

School and Educational Influences

The next area of review concerning causes of violent behavior is school and education-related factors. Major longitudinal research in this area has been conducted by Polk and Schafer and and reported in their book Schools and Delinquency (1972). Delinquency is the official, legal definition for violent and aggressive behaviors when such behaviors are reported to police and youth are apprehended and prosecuted. However, it should be noted that most crime in schools is not reported to the police. Polk and Schafer argue that the structural organization and operational mechanisms of the school assure that there must be students in the failure and discipline problem roles as contrasted to the roles of high achievers and prosocial students.

Polk and Schafer assert that the commitment to delinquent and violent behavior results in large part from negative school experiences, and that there are basic defects in the way schools are organized and impact on youth from low-income families. Non-college-bound youth develop progressively negative attitudes toward

formal, college-oriented academic work. The tracking system used in many high schools reinforces this disparity. For low-income youth school comes to be viewed as an irrelevant experience. They note, as have several other researchers, that patterns of misconduct established in school clearly pave the way to delinquent behavior beyond the school. They argue that teachers have low expectations of these youngsters and use inappropriate teaching methods. Restructuring of school programs and reeducation of teachers are needed if the current loser cycle is to be reversed for these youth.

Elliott and Voss (1974) also reported major longitudinal research on school behavior and the emergence of delinquency and dropouts. They found that the critical conditions for the emergence of delinquent behavior are real or anticipated failure in school, normlessness, and exposure to other norm violating youth. School is the critical generating milieu for delinquent behavior by bringing together in one setting all of the facilitating conditions for adverse behavior. Failure in school is visible. Delinquent behavior is a face saving way out.

McPartland and McDill (1977) participation in a conference of major specialists on school violence and delinquency and compiled the papers in a book Violence In Schools. They also reported some of their own research on school behavior. The focus of the book is on four classes of behavior problems: (1) attacks, thefts, and withdrawals, (2) drug and alcohol abuse, (3) student protests and demonstrations, and (4) racial and ethnic group tensions. They assert that schools play a direct role in promoting delinquent behavior, to a great extent because schools do not involve students in any of the decisions affecting their lives in school. They also argue that the current report card system which reduces all evaluation of performance in a course to a single letter grade has generated a group of perpetual losers. These perpetual losers become the school's discipline problems.

Frease (1973) conducted research on the tracking system employed in high schools in the state of Oregon. In his review of previous research he noted the finding that low track youth are low in ability and that they become increasingly dissatisfied with school, their absenteeism and truancy grows, and their general commitment to school wanes. Lower track placement carries low status. It becomes impossible to get out of a lower track, even if school performance improves. Their own results show that low track high school students have little affection for school, they get low grades, and they have low academic self concepts. Increasingly their friends are other predelinquent or delinquent youth. They concluded that ". . . youngsters not going to college . . . face a major adjustment problem in which delinquent behavior appears to be a response" (p. 445).

Kelly (1975) investigated the effects of tracking while controlling the correlated variables of socioeconomic status, sex, and school achievement on the emergence of delinquent behavior.

Self reports of delinquent behavior were used. He concluded that tracking position is a significant predictor of delinquent behavior. Duke (1976b) also conducted research on high school age youth who were discipline problems in school. From his results he hypothesized that misbehavior in school is traceable to low IQ, lack of success in school, and low teacher expectations. The Senate Subcommittee report (Bayh, 1977) also linked violent behavior in high schools to learning disabilities. It noted that the learning disability may lead to failure in school which in turn generates frustration and lowered self concept. The resulting behavioral adaptation may be violence and delinquency. However, this linking of learning disability with violent behavior must still be regarded as tentative and uncertain.

This area of school causes, along with evidence from the effects of homelife and TV viewing, probably provides basic explanations for the genesis of much violent and delinquent behavior in high schools. But other societal and environmental conditions have been noted. The Senate Subcommittee report (Bayh, 1977) and the NIE Safe Schools Report (1978) both noted that the large city high school seems in itself to be a facilitator of aggressive and violent behavior. It is impersonal, it is hard to manage, it compresses thousands of youth in small space, and it facilitates delinquent peer association.

Teachers, in the NEA's 1976 nationwide survey on discipline and school violence, cite irresponsible parents and poor home conditions as the two major causes of discipline problems and violence in schools. However, they also go on to list overcrowded classes, irrelevant curriculum, lack of service for exceptional children, and lack of teacher authority as other major contributing causes. Dr. Owen Kiernan, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee (1975), listed six contributing factors in school violence: (1) lethargic courts which encourage youth to see themselves as not subject to legal control, (2) the openness and lack of control in schools, (3) excessive concern about student rights, (4) teacher apathy, (5) parent ignorance and indifference and (6) collateral educational influences such as TV and films which glorify violence and crime. The National School Boards Association (1977) organized an Ad Hoc Committee on School Discipline and surveyed a variety of schools regarding discipline and violence. They concluded that among the contributing factors to the problem are (1) large classes, (2) peer influence, (3) lax enforcement of rules, (4) incompetent and indifferent teachers, (5) poor communication between home and parents, (6) poor home conditions, (7) weak controls in the schools, (8) emergence of student rights, (9) integration which has brought diverse cultures together, (10) weak administrative support and (11) irrelevant curriculum.

In the NIE's Safe Schools Study Report (1978) regression analyses were conducted with data from 604 schools using the percent of students who reported being robbed or attacked as the criterion

variable. Four school variables were significant predictors: (1) improved student governance and rule enforcement, (2) fair and equal treatment of students, (3) teaching relevant subject matter to suit student interests and needs, and (4) having smaller classes with teachers instructing a smaller number of different students.

From this review it is clear that the causes of high school discipline problems, violence and delinquency are multifarious. They focus principally on weakened home and family structure, the heavy dose of crime and violence modelled by TV, school experiences which precipitate a failure-frustration-aggression sequence, and school and societal conditions which make it easy and rewarding for youth to engage in violence and crime as an effective adaptation or coping mechanism. The schools cannot reshape society but they could do much to set their own houses in order.

The Cures

Solutions to the problems of discipline, violence and crime in the high schools are proferred by one and all, but validated approaches with supporting evaluative research evidence are few. The most widely and effectively designed and researched approaches are those growing out of the behavior management or modification systems which are based on reinforcement theories. Most of these approaches have been implemented in school settings.

Behavior Modification Approaches

Davidson and Seidman (1974) reviewed studies of behavior modification (BM) and their relationship with aggressive behavior, violence and delinquency. They concluded that, in spite of some persistent methodological problems in the research, the behavioral approaches have generally yielded positive effects on academic performance, broader positive social behaviors, and the reduction of aggressive behavior, violence and delinquency. Wildman and Wildman (1975) have also reviewed the BM literature with special attention to duration and generalizability of results. Much of the criticism of BM has focussed on its excessively specific and temporary impact. Wildman and Wildman concluded that long lasting, generalizable effects are possible if the BM program follows these prescriptions:

1) reward schedules must be varied

2) incompatible behaviors must not be targets of BM

3) progressively increase delay between getting tokens and exchanging them for tangibles

4) gradually decrease the amount of reinforcement

5) when treatment ends teach those who will continue work with the subjects how to maintain desired behaviors

6) involve parents in the treatment program

7) use small readily available reinforcers

8) teach subjects to rate their own behavior

9) have a number of people involved in delivery of reinforcers

10) involve people in treatment who will also work with the same youth later.

Ribes-Inesta and Bandura (1976) edited and published the papers from the Third Symposium on Behavior Modification. These papers provide detailed analyses of various aspects of behavior management procedures. Schwitzebel, for example, describes procedures for shaping attendance behavior after noting that youth who exhibit aggressive, violent and delinquent behavior are often characterized by inability to keep appointments (p. 39). Sarason describes procedures for the use of models and information in teaching prosocial behaviors to aggressive and delinquent youth (p. 71). Phillips et al. describe the Achievement Place Model, a community based, family style behavior modification program for youth who display predelinquent behavior (p. 171). Reid and Patterson present a program for the modification of aggression and stealing behavior in the home setting (p. 123). In a concluding chapter Bandura observes that most behavior is learned observationally. He reviews the various conditions which instigate and support aggressive behavior.

McLaughlin (1976a) reviewed the literature on self-control procedures in the management of classroom behavior problems. He concluded that self control procedures are about as effective as traditional behavior modification intervention procedures. McLaughlin (1976b) also reviewed the literature on the use of response cost procedures to reduce aggressive-disruptive behavior. This involves giving subjects a set of tokens at the outset, detailing rule violations, and taking tokens from subjects when violations occur. He concluded that the response cost approach can be effective in the classroom setting without undesirable side effects.

Strain, Cooke and Apolloni (1976) argued that BM programs often cannot be practically administered by teachers because of the time demands of all the students in the secondary classroom. They argue that peers can be used to offset this shortcoming. Peers can be used as models and as reinforcement managers. Jensen (1975) has also described a BM system based not on a controlling relationship between teacher and pupil but rather on a cooperative approach. Jensen argues for the power of verbal reinforcers with secondary students, for the use of precision in communication, and for immediate aversive intervention to control grossly deviant behavior. He also urges teachers to be somewhat relaxed, permissive and reasonable in working with high school students.

Silverman and Silverman (1975) studied the effects of BM on aggressive classroom behavior of 9th graders. He found that once

a BM program was established, merely pointing out instances of aggressive behavior tended to suppress it, but adding reinforcement in the form of free time for periods of no aggressive behavior led to larger reductions of aggression. Tsoi and Yule (1976) also conducted a BM study in a natural classroom setting. Three disruptive children in a classroom were targeted and reinforcement was given to them or the entire class contingent upon the good behavior of the targets. Both approaches were successful but there were individual variations in the degree to which good behavior persisted.

Drabman, Jarvie and Archbold (1976) reviewed the use of the BM technique of ignoring bad behavior and concluded that classroom teachers may encounter troubles with this technique. While the teacher might ignore instances of bad behavior, other students might be responding and reinforcing. The teacher might also fail in his/her efforts to ignore and instead subtly reinforce. Drabman et al. assert that the technique is useful if the teacher can avoid the pitfalls. Stuart, Jayaratne and Tripodi (1976) worked with teachers and parents in establishing behavioral contracts for students in grades 6-12 who had been referred by principals because of their aggressive-disruptive behavior in school. Rewards were established for good behavior and sanctions for bad behavior. A control group received a placebo treatment. Significant improvements in behavior were found for two school indices of behavior and two home indices.

Several studies of BM were conducted in institutional settings but nevertheless offer some insights for school practice. Jesness (1975) carried out a study with two large samples of 15 to 17 year old boys who had been committed to correctional institutions. One group was treated with BM techniques, the other with transactional analysis (TA). Positive changes were found for both groups on a number of criterion measures. Generally, students who had been treated with BM showed major gains in prosocial behavior while the TA group showed greatest gains on psychological adjustment measures. Holt, Hobbs and Hankins (1976) studied the effects of token reinforcement on 15 year old boys in a classroom setting in a correctional institution. The criterion measures were several indices of productive classroom and social behavior. Their results were variable. Some indices such as in-seat and assignment completion behavior showed improvement while social interaction behavior did not show consistent changes.

These behavioral management approaches to aggressive, disruptive and violent delinquent behavior show much promise and some limitations. Frequently it seems necessary for classroom teachers to have special training and outside assistance to implement them. At the high school level the use of free time, verbal reinforcers, and other natural payoffs may seem more appropriate than token economies. The behavioral contract, self control and reinforcement, and peer reinforcement seem also to be of great potential value to secondary teachers.

Educational Approaches

Some other approaches to maladaptive behavior might best be described as academic or educational approaches. In a major study of youth crime in eight areas in the State of Illinois, Schwartz and Puntil (1975) examined many different variables in the etiology of juvenile misbehavior and delinquency. They concluded that the school is the critical focal area of youth crime and that the school, through the failure experience which it creates for so many youth, generates problems of aggressive behavior, violence and delinquency. Thus, one critical approach to school programming for aggressive-disruptive youth is to attempt to reverse the failure syndrome.

Webb and Cormier (1972) conducted an experimental study in which 22 disruptive junior high students were drawn from four mathematics classes and given a special academic program in which all teaching was guided by explicit behavioral objectives. In addition criterion tests were developed for the objectives and special remedial instruction was designed for the specific objectives and tests. Students were given a list of the objectives, the remedial assignments, and free time when the assignment for a given day was completed. The treatment increased task relevant behavior and reduced disruptive behavior. The treatment effect was maintained when the students went back to traditional instruction.

Van Avery (1975) described a humanitarian high school program which he developed in Sarasota, Florida. The purposes were described as "places to come and to go from, places in which to gather, to find support, to learn skills, to meet other people" (p. 177). collaboration among students, community, parents, school board, staff and administration guided all efforts. School rules were cooperatively enforced. There was much respect and trust expected from all involved. Van Avery reports that violence was reduced and there were few complaints from teachers and other school staff regarding student behavior. In contrast Wint (1975) described a high school program implemented at Wyandanch, New York, which stressed basic and strict discipline. Prior to the program the school was filled with violence. Three years later after implementing the program, it was peaceful and well organized. The major emphases of the approach were the teaching of skills and abilities in quiet and orderly classrooms. The principal runs the school. Rules are clearly stated on the first day and they are enforced. Teachers are backed and punishment of offending students is swift and consistent. Chronic discipline cases are assigned to a separate special classroom. The program is successful in controlling violence.

Maynard (1977) described a program at Cleveland High School in Seattle, Washington which transformed the school from severe problems of violence, race tension, dropouts, and absenteeism to the opposite condition in which all these problems had almost disappeared. A positive school climate was developed and efforts were made to meet the needs of disruptive youth. School was changed to a place perceived by students as designed to help them with meaningful, nonthreatening success experiences in the class-

room. Rules of conduct were developed cooperatively by students, staff and administrators. The following guidelines were followed in developing the program:

1) build a positive school climate

2) help students find success

3) model appropriate behavior

4) involve staff and students in all facets of school

5) have open and honest communication

6) build trust

7) model and teach good interpersonal relationships

Wallace (1973) described a program for alienated and delinquent junior high and high school youth in Newton, Massachusetts. Special counselors meet with the troubled youngsters individually and in small groups offering academic remedial assistance, counselling and group therapy. They also meet with the students' teachers to help them find ways to work more effectively with the target students. The counselors' general role is to support and strengthen the students' academic and social behavior. The program was evaluated by an outside agency which found it to be highly effective in solving youth behavior problems and helping target cases achieve success in school.

Powell (1975) recounted his experience in working with the Public Schools of Columbia, South Carolina, in the Model Schools Project. Two types of intervention were introduced, one for the regular school program and the other for youth who were aggressive-disruptive and delinquency prone. The innovations introduced in the regular school program included:

1) structuring academic and social success for all students

2) recognizing accomplishments and value of all students

3) providing educational freedom

4) offering special training in self direction

5) teaching basic skills effectively

6) fostering extracurricular interests

7) offering opportunities to be heard

All of these innovations were implemented in the regular school program. Special intervention centers were also established for the purpose of coordinating community and school services. The

center diagnoses, treats, and monitors students who are delinquency prone. The centers are housed in the high schools. They offer counselling, home liaison, work-study programs, group therapy, and career education.

O'Brien (1976) described the In-School Suspension program implemented in Minneapolis high schools for youth who have exhibited such behavior problems as alcoholism, drug abuse, truancy or violence in the classroom. Assignment to the suspension room is usually for a two to five day period. Students assigned to the suspension room must do all their regular assignments plus other special tasks assigned by the suspension room teacher. Assistance from other community agencies is sought to help the youngsters solve their special problems. Evaluations of the program indicate mixed success.

Some other writers offer suggestions for the development of new school programs to overcome the problems of student violence, aggression, disruption and delinquency. Gavon and Ferdinand (1975) recommend (1) the employment of counselors and social workers to deal specifically with individual problem youth and their families, (2) special ungraded classes for severe misbehavior cases, and (3) development of new special vocational programs for high school youngsters to keep them in school. They note that there is a need to reexamine many college preparatory programs which are forced upon all students and to develop instead appropriate career-oriented programs for the many youth who will not go on to college.

Duke (1977) proposed a "Systematic Management Plan for School Discipline" which is uniquely appropriate for junior and senior high schools. There are six major components to the program: (1) collection of accurate data on discipline problems, (2) development of awareness of the school as an institution operated according to rules, (3) rewarding students who obey rules, (4) use of sound methods to resolve conflicts, (5) development of a team approach to handling behavior problems, and (6) in-service education on school discipline. Duke also stresses involvement of students, parents and the community in confronting and clarifying problems and in developing corrective measures.

Charles Lewis (1977), Executive Secretary of the American Personnel and Guidance Association in testimony to the Senate Subcommittee urged schools to (1) develop alternative programs for problem youth within the high school program, not in an outside alternative school, (2) involve parents and the whole community, (3) involve students in all planning, and (4) increase the number of trained counselors to deal specifically with behavior problems. The first suggestion, to develop alternative programs within the high school program, was based on the assumption that such programs would be more effective in helping deviant students maintain normal relationships with other youth.

The Senate Subcommittee (Bayh, 1977) offered dozens of specific suggestions to deal with school violence, delinquency and

vandalism. The suggestions are classified by level of implementation from the individual teacher, classroom and student up to the principal and superintendent level, to the community and state level, and finally to the role of the Federal government. In summary the Subcommittee made three comprehensive recommendations: (1) school boards and state education agencies should develop programs to prevent violence, delinquency and vandalism, (2) within a school teachers, parents, students and administrators should work together in developing programs to reduce violence, delinquency and vandalism, and (3) the Federal government should enact programs to assist states, cities and schools in fighting these problems.

The National Institute of Education's report Violent Schools--Safe Schools (1977) offers the hope that the problems of violence, delinquency and vandalism are not getting worse and may even be abating. However, the report shows clearly how serious the problems still are. It reports the results of a survey of students, teachers and principals who were asked to suggest ways to handle the problems. The major recommendation from all groups was to control discipline in school and in classes. Principals strongly recommended the use of security personnel and devices. The report also emphasizes the key role of the principal in structuring a climate of order and positive governance. The report notes that large city schools are often cold and impersonal management systems. Ways should be found to increase interaction among teachers, students and principals. In-service training for teachers and principals is another vital factor. The report also notes the crucial role of joint planning efforts among teachers, students, administrators and parents to deal with discipline problems. Finally, the report suggests that the level of violence in a school is affected by the extent to which students see the subject matter taught in their courses to be relevant to their own needs and interests. Students who perceive the curriculum as irrelevant are more likely to lack motivation to learn, to resist teacher direction and control, and even to strike back at the perceived sources of frustration.

Finally, the National School Boards Association's Ad Hoc Committee on Discipline (1977) studied the problems in schools throughout the U.S. and examined closely the schools in which successful programs to control violence, delinquency and vandalism were operating. They made six recommendations: (1) establish a school task force composed of parents, teachers, students, administrators and school board members to survey the problems, (2) involve students, teachers, parents, and administrators in developing discipline policies and procedures, (3) formulate and distribute written statements of rules and policies for discipline, (4) provide in-service training on discipline, (5) enforce the rules and prosecute all illegal actions, and (6) establish alternative educational programs in the high school program.

The Classroom Teacher

These various suggestions call for action at a school, community and/or state level. However, the classroom teacher

faces the problems often with little hope for concerted school or community effort. A number of writers suggest procedures which the individual teacher can use in dealing with classroom discipline problems.

Kounin's classic study (1970) of teachers' classroom management and discipline techniques resulted in recognition of the now famous "ripple effect." Ripple effect is the disturbance of surrounding students caused by a teacher's scolding a target child who is misbehaving. The teacher's scolding often produces disruption of class activities and even more misbehavior. Kounin stressed the importance of clarity and firmness when teachers had to scold. He found five dimensions of teacher behavior which were correlated with good discipline: (1) teacher "withitness" or knowing, at all times, what is going on in the classroom, (2) smoothness in transition from one classroom activity to another, (3) group focusing or being able to keep all children on a task or activity, (4) being able to generate challenge and interest, and (5) being able to provide varied, appropriate, and stimulating seatwork. Kounin noted that a teacher must be able to simultaneously help individuals and maintain control of the whole class.

Moskowitz and Hayman (1974) studied first year teachers in inner city junior high schools. Students were asked to identify their best teachers, other teachers were identified randomly, and finally new, first year teachers were identified. Teachers were observed on a number of occasions in the classroom. They found that the first contact at the beginning of the school year was critical in establishing control and behavior patterns. Best teachers used more behaviors that conveyed personal acceptance to students, joked more, gave more beneficial suggestions, and gave more verbal reinforcement. Best teachers kept close tabs on discipline problems and corrected them before they developed. New teachers often let situations get out of hand before even attempting remediation. Best teachers were also able to make class positive and exciting while first year teachers maintained a more negative atmosphere. New teachers also did much more criticizing of students. In summary, best teachers are a combination of effective control and humanistic behaviors.

Kindsvatter (1978) suggested that discipline techniques must be tailored to the student's problem and must be designed to help the student adjust and cope, not just to control him/her. He argues that there are three basic causes of misbehavior in school--(1) severe emotional problems, (2) negative attitudes toward teachers and subject matter or (3) capricious behavior--and for each the teacher must find a suitable strategy and develop a clear behavioral expectation. Overall, the major initial strategy is for the teacher to hold a private teacher/student conference to clarify the problem. A specific strategy is then implemented, in cooperation with the student, to correct the problem.

Leviton (1976) also argued that discipline must be individualized to the problems and needs of the individual student. He too

argued that the teacher must diagnose the problem and then carry out and evaluate a strategy to help the student. He suggests that there are four basic student problems--conduct disorders, anxious withdrawal, immature behavior, and socialized delinquency--and twenty teacher actions or strategies which can be employed.

These several sets of guidelines for teachers offer concrete suggestions and strategies to deal with classroom discipline problems. Several writers also call for a general humanization of the school and a restoration of a positive affective climate. DeCecco (1975), in his large analysis of the "civil war in the high schools" argued that a humanistic climate must be restored, that schools have become cold, hostile places which breed crime and violence. He urged that there be open negotiation among students, teachers, parents and administrators regarding school problems and that the schools become true democratic institutions. Glasser (1969, 1978) is even more explicit in suggesting how teachers can restore a true humanistic climate which will overcome discipline problems. He urges first that corporal punishment be abolished and then that students be taken into the management process. The teacher must become a person who cares and helps students succeed. The class meeting is at the heart of the Glasser system. Here teachers and students discuss their problems openly and find ways to resolve them. There is also much stress on helping students succeed and getting them to be responsible for their own behavior. Glasser urges that teachers and parents cooperate to control students' TV viewing. Schools Without Failure (1969) has helped many teachers develop classrooms in which good behavior is the rule.

Summary

From this review of the problems, the causes and the cures for violence, crime, delinquency, vandalism, and truancy in the high schools it is clear that we know the problem very well, the causes are only moderately well known, and for the most part we are guessing about solutions. There is very little research evidence to guide practitioners in developing programs to deal with these discipline problems. Only the field of behavioral management or modification has developed some sound research evidence.

Nevertheless some suggestions seem warranted concerning severe discipline problems at the high school level. The following list represents major priorities based on the literature examined in this review:

1) Federal and State governments should support the development and rigorous research evaluation of a variety of comprehensive programs to deal with social behavior of high school youth. These programs should be developed as theoretical models based on the best research available and the research evaluation must be sound.

2) Schools with severe problems of violence, crime, vandalism and truancy should organize a task force of teachers, parents, administrators and students to survey the problems and develop plans for remedial programs.

3) In-service programs should be developed to help teachers and administrators learn how to deal effectively with youth behavior problems. Behavior management techniques are especially promising.

4) Teachers, students, parents, and administrators should cooperate in developing and enforcing school rules.

5) School curricula should be carefully examined in relation to discipline problems. Alternative in-school programs should be offered to meet the needs of noncollege bound youth and to help all students achieve success in the high school program.

6) Educators should not condone illegal behavior in the school setting. Crime and delinquency should be prosecuted. The school should not be, as it now often is, a safe haven for crime.

7) Basic skills should be stressed and taught effectively. They are fundamental to success in all aspects of high school programs.

8) The principal must take the lead in developing a positive, humanistic climate in the school. In many big city high schools with huge enrollment, this is a formidable task.

9) Special classes should be developed within the school for short term treatment of severe discipline problems as an alternative to suspension.

10) Explicit efforts must be made to involve high school youth in developing self direction and self control.

11) Vocational and career education programs should be developed to bridge the gap from school to work of high school students who exhibit severe behavior problems.

12) Each school should have a system, coordinated by guidance counselors, to diagnose and plan programs for severe discipline cases.

13) There should be much recognition of positive behaviors of students.

14) In schools with severe and widespread behavior problems, security devices and personnel should be employed.

15) Schools of education should bolster teacher training in the area of classroom management, and they should work closely with schools and teachers in attacking the problems. Much is known about suitable teaching methods for discipline problems, but beginning teachers seem not to know these methods.

Results of the NIE's Safe Schools study would explicitly suggest four critical factors for reducing crime and violence in the schools: (1) strict and consistent governance and rule enforcement, (2) fairness in the development and administration of rules, (3) effective teacher-student interaction, and (4) courses and subject matter which are perceived as relevant to the interests and needs of students.

The problems of school discipline, violence, crime, vandalism and truancy have grown to large proportions in many American schools. Principals and school boards often seem reluctant to admit the problems. The problems begin or are caused by forces outside the school. Poor home conditions, TV violence, a climate of crime in the community, gangs, and peer crime influences are all initial contributors to the problems which surface in school. But the school also contributes with poor teaching, a negative school climate, a dose of failure for many students, and irrelevant curricula. The school can take positive action along with other youth agencies to alleviate the problems and even create a positive social and academic climate in which all youth can succeed.

References

Bayh, B. Challenge for the third century: Education in a safe environment--final report on the nature and prevention of school violence and vandalism. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Cavan, R. S., & Ferdinand, T. N. Juvenile delinquency. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1975.

Conger, R. D. Social control and social learning models of delinquent behavior. Criminology, 1976, 14, 17-40.

Davidson, W. S., & Seidman, E. Studies of behavior modification and juvenile delinquency: A review, methodological critique, and social perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 998-1011.

DeCecco, J. P., & Richards, A. K. Civil war in the high schools. Psychology Today, November 1975, 9, 51-56; 120.

Drabman, R. S., Jarvie, G. J., & Archbold, J. The use and misuse of extinction in classroom behavioral programs. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 470-476.

Duke, D. L. A systematic management plan for school discipline. NASSP Bulletin, 1977, 61, 1-10.

Duke, D. L. Who misbehaves?--A high school studies its discipline problems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1976b, 12, 65-85.

Duke, D. L. How administrators view the crisis in school discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 325-330.

Elliott, D. S., & Voss, H. L. Delinquency and dropout. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Book, 1974.

Feldhusen, J. F., Aversano, F. M., & Thurston, J. R. Prediction of youth contacts with law enforcement agencies. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1976, 3, 235-253.

Feldhusen, J. F., Roeser, T. D., & Thurston, J. R. Prediction of social adjustment over a period of 6 or 9 years. Journal of Special Education, 1977, 11, 29-36.

Feldhusen, J. F., Thurston, J. R., & Benning, J. J. A longitudinal study of delinquency and other aspects of children's behavior. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1973, 1, 341-351.

Frease, D. E. Schools and delinquency: Some intervening processes. Pacific Sociological Review, 1973, 16, 426-448.

Gallup, G. H. Ninth annual Gallup poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977, 59, 33-48.

Glasser, W. Schools without failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Glasser, W. Disorder in our schools: Causes and remedies. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 331-333.

Greenberg, B. S. British children and televised violence. The Public Opinion Quarterly, 1974, 38, 531-547.

Holt, M. M., Hobbs, T. R., & Hankins, R. The effects of token reinforcement on delinquents' classroom behavior. Psychology In The Schools, 1976, 13, 341-347.

Jensen, R. E. Cooperative relations between secondary teachers and students: Some behavioral strategies. Adolescence, 1975, 10, 469-482.

Jesness, C. F. Comparative effectiveness of behavior modification and transactional analysis programs for delinquents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 758-779.

Jessor, J., & Jessor, S. L. Problem behavior and psychosocial development. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Justice, B., Justice, R., & Kraft, I. A. Early warning signs of violence: Is a triad enough? American Journal of Psychiatry, 1974, 131, 457-459.

Kelly, D. H. Status origins, track position, and delinquent involvement: A self report analysis. Sociological Quarterly, 1975, 16, 264-271.

Kiernan, O. B. School violence and vandalism. Statement to Sub-Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. Eric Document 106987.

Kindsvatter, R. A new view of the dynamics of discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 322-325.

Knight, B. J., & West, D. J. Temporary and continuing delinquency. British Journal of Criminology, 1975, 15, 43-50.

Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Lefkowitz, M. M., Huesmann, L. R., Walder, L. O., & Eron, L. D. Environmental variables as predictors of aggressive behavior. International Journal of Group Tensions, 1973, 3, 30-47.

Leifer, A. D., Gordon, N. J., & Graves, S. B. Children's television: More than mere entertainment. Harvard Educational Review, 1974, 44, 213-245.

Leviton, H. S. The individualization of discipline for behavior disordered pupils. Psychology In The Schools, 1976, 13, 445-448.

Lewis, C. L. Report of American Personnel and Guidance Association Task Force on Juvenile Delinquency and School Vandalism. Report to Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, Senator Birch Bayh, 1977.

Liebert, R. M. Television and children's aggressive behavior: Another look. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1974, 34, 99-107.

Maynard, W. Working with disruptive youth. Education Leadership, 1977, 34, 417-421.

McLaughlin, T. F. Self control procedures in the management of classroom behavior problems. Education, 1976a, 96, 379-383.

McLaughlin, T. F., & Scott, J. W. The use of response cost to reduce inappropriate behavior in educational settings. Corrective and Social Psychiatry, Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, 1976b, 25, 32-34.

McPartland, J. M., & McDill, E. L. Violence in schools. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.

Moskowitz, G., & Hayman, J. L. Journal of Educational Research, 1976, 69, 283-289.

National Education Association. Teacher opinion poll. Today's Education, 1974, 63, 105.

National Education Association. Teacher opinion poll: Discipline. Today's Education, 1976, 65. 20.

National Institute of Education. Violent schools--safe schools. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.

National School Boards Association. Report: Discipline in our big city schools. Washington, D. C.: National School Boards Association, 1977.

Neill, S. B. Violence and vandalism: Dimensions and correctives. Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 302-307.

Newsweek, 1977, 40, 62-70, September 12.

O'Brien, D. M. In-school suspension: Is it the new way to punish productively? American School Board Journal, 1976, 163, 35-37.

Polk, K., & Schafer, W. E. Schools and delinquency. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Powell, W. C. Educational intervention as a preventive measure. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1975, 2, 397-407.

Ribes-Inesta, E., & Bandura, A. Analysis of delinquency and aggression. New York: John Wiley, 1976.

Rubel, R. J. The unruly school. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977.

Schwartz, G., & Puntil, J. E. Summary and policy implications of the youth and society in Illinois reports. Chicago: Institute for Juvenile Research, 1140 South Paulina Street, 1975.

Silverman, S., & Silverman, H. Reducing verbal and physical aggression in a ninth grade class using a group contingency. School Applications of Learning Theory, 1975, 7, 20-26.

Strain, P. S., Cooke, T. P., & Apolloni, T. The role of peers in modifying classmates social behavior: A review. Journal of Special Education, 1976, 10, 351-356.

Stuart, R. B., Sirinika, J., & Tripoldi, T. Changing adolescent deviant behavior through reprogramming the behavior of parents and teachers: An experimental evaluation. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 1976, 8, 132-144.

Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. Television and Growing Up: The Impact of Televised Violence. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

Time, 1977, 110, 62-75, November 14.

Tsoi, M. M., & Yule, W. The effects of group reinforcement in classroom behavior modification. Educational Studies, 1976, 2, 129-140.

Van Avery, D. The humanitarian approach. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 57, 177-178.

Wallace, A., & Wheeler, M. Youth development program. Help for alienated youth. School Counselor, 1973, 21, 61-62.

Webb, A. B., & Cormier, W. H. Improving classroom behavior and achievement. Journal of Experimental Education, 1972, 41, 92-96.

Wildman, R. W., & Wildman, R. W. The generalization of behavior modification procedures: A review--with special emphasis on classroom applications. Psychology In The Schools, 1975, 12, 432-448.

Wint, J. The crackdown. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 57, 175-176.